



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,978	06/29/2001	Michael Bradford Ault	AUS920010373US1	9274

7590 06/09/2005

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

POLTORAK, PIOTR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,978

Applicant(s)

AULT ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Poltorak

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment, and remarks therein, received on 3/15/2005 have been entered and carefully considered.
2. The Amendment introduces a new limitation into the originally independent claims 1, 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40. The newly introduced limitation has required a new search and consideration of the pending claims. The new search has resulted in newly discovered prior art. New grounds of rejection based on the newly discovered prior art follow below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 38 is directed to "the result" in claim 29, which was removed by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2134

1. Claims 1, 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Hadfield et al.

2. As per claims 1 *Hadfield et al.* teach Windows NT architecture that is divided into a user mode and kernel mode layers (*Fig. 3.1, pg. 64*). In the kernel mode layer *Hadfield et al.* show executive components such as the Security Reference Monitor that governs all access, creation, and deletion of objects with the system (*Fig. 3.1, pg. 64-65 and 68*). *Hadfield et al.* teach that the log-on process is at the user mode layer (*Fig. 3.1, pg. 64*). Even though log-on process involves registry access (e.g. *pg. 166*), being at the user mode layer the log-on process does not have direct access to registries but rather it must utilize executive services to accomplish the task (e.g. *Fig. 3.6 pg. 78 and Fig. 3.4 pg. 76*).

The above reads on issuing a registry-independent instruction to a registry adapter (*executive services*) to perform an operation on the user registry, and responsive to the registry adapter's executing registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry, receiving a result of the operation.

3. Claims 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40 are substantially equivalent to claim 1; therefore claims 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40 are similarly rejected.

4. Also, as per claims 39 and 40 Windows is implemented on computers that inherently comprise a bus system, CPU and memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2134

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-28 and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Windows Operating System in light of *Hadfield et al.* (*Hadfield et al.* (Lee Hadfield, Dave Hater, Dave Bixler, "Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook", 1997, ISBN: 078971213) and *Murray et al.* (William H. Murray, III and Chris H. Pappas, "Windows programming, an Introduction, 1990, ISBN: 0078815363).
6. As per claims 2-3 *Hadfield et al.* teach that NT operating system is an object oriented system (*Hadfield et al.*, pg. 67, *The Object Manager*) and *Murray et al.* teach that Windows applications make DLLs calls, and that DLLs contain predefined functions that link with application programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the registry-independent instruction that are the function calls to a function in a DLL (*Murray et al.*, *Dynamic Link Libraries*, pg. 15). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to implement standard functions without need to re-create new procedures for common operations (*Murray et al.*, *Dynamic Link Libraries*, pg. 15).
7. As per claims 4-5 *Murray et al.* teach that when programming for Windows object-oriented programming is used, an object is an abstract data type that consists of a data structure (*object*, e.g. a user object) and various functions (*methods*) that act on the data structure (*Murray et al.*, pg. 27 §2).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the function call to be a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language as taught by *Murray et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to communicate in the Windows environment and to simplify the program (*Murray et al.*, pg. 15 § 5-6).

8. As per claims 6 -9 data read from a user registry (e.g., *user name of a user object*) must have been first written into the registry (e.g. *using User Manager to create a user object, Hadfield et al., Fig. 8.1 pg. 213*).
9. Claims 11-19, 21-28 and 30-37 are substantially equivalent to claims 2-9; therefore claims 11-19, 21-28 and 30-37 are similarly rejected.
10. As per claim 38 Official Notice is taken that implementing a completion status code is old and well-known practice in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement a completion status code. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would be motivated to employ a completion status code in order to assure the correct execution of the program.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2134

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571)272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Signature

5/27/05
Date


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100